

## REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application and allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

The title has been amended in response to the comments of the examiner.

With respect to the objection to the drawings, the feature 18a has been removed from the specification because, actually, while both doors 18, 20 are shown in the embodiment of Figs. 1-5, the corresponding door 18a is not shown in Figs. 7-9, although it is clear how the door fits on and is used in that particular embodiment, analogous to the previous embodiment.

Also, new formal drawings of Figs. 7-9 are enclosed.

In response to the rejection of claims 4-6, 11 and 17, various amendments have been made relative to the issue of the "horizontal grooves", and the claims are now believed to be in compliance with 35 U.S.C. 112.

The examiner has rejected claims 1, 2, 8, 12 and 15 as unpatentable over Kilmer U.S. Patent No. 1,833,081.

Kilmer shows a packing box in which a lid or cover thereof can be unscrewed to open the box, and then reduced in size by sawing to provide a shelf. Note in page 1, lines 62-70:

"The lid or cover A' is a greater area than a cross section of the interior of the box, so that when it is applied, it can be firmly secured by any suitable fastenings to the edges of the side members of the box. The fastenings should be such, for example screws, as can be readily removed..."  
(emphasis added)

Because the lid or cover A', which as shown in Fig. 2, is "a greater area than a cross section of the interior of the box", it needs to be reduced in size before it can be used as a shelf, in that it will not initially fit into the box. This is also clear because of

the above language concerning the lid or cover A': "...It can be firmly secured...to the edges of the side members of the box." This oversize is of course needed so that screws may pass through lid or cover A' into the edges of the side members of the box.

Further, as stated at page 1 of Kilmer, lines 84 to 92:

"By sawing the lid or cover A', for example, along the lines a, two partition or shelf members will be provided, and when these are inserted in the proper channels or grooves a in the opposite sides of the box A, and the latter is positioned to rest on one of the sides connecting the aforesaid channeled sides, it will be seen that the box will be divided into three superposed compartments or spaces..."

Accordingly, it is clear that what is taught by Kilmer is not a carrying case having a separable, recloseable door. According to the teachings of Kilmer, the "door", which is lid or cover A', is sawed into pieces to provide a smaller shelf. Clearly, reattachment of the "door" of Kilmer, in the manner called for in independent claims 1 and 16 of this application, is not taught and not feasible.

Furthermore, what is called for in claims 1 and 16 is not screws, but "a latch mechanism", specifically latches 22, projecting flange 40 at the bottom of each door, and related parts.

It is submitted that screws are not a latch mechanism, a latch mechanism being for rapid opening and closing. Claims 1 and 16 further distinguish from Kilmer, in that the first door is "sized to substantially fit within said carrying case body", as illustrated in Fig. 6, for example, where doors 18, 20 are slid within the case.

It is believed that the amendments to claims 1 and 16 are clearly supported by the specification, and that claims 1 and 16, and their dependent claims, provide clear distinction over Kilmer. In Kilmer, a side of a box is sawed up to provide a shelf after the box is opened by the removal of screws or the like. This provides no suggestion as

in this invention of “a first door” which is completely separable from the “carrying case body”, and which permits “reattachment of the first door to the carrying case body” in a manner of a door which opens and closes a multitude of times. Further in accordance with this invention, claims 1 and 16 call for the door to be holdable “...in a position at least partially within said carrying case body...said first door being sized to substantially fit within said carrying case body.” As previously stated, the original side of the box of Kilmer is oversized, and will not substantially fit within the carrying case body, as specifically stated at page 1, lines 64-65.

Thus, it is submitted that claims 1 and 16, and their dependent claims, are patentable over Kilmer.

The examiner has rejected claims 4, 6, 13 and 17 as unpatentable over Kilmer, further in view of Kump U.S. Patent 4,334,359. Kump is added to show the concept of a second, removable door. However, Kump fails to add any disclosure that teaches the distinctions of claims 1 and 16 discussed above from the cited prior art. As such, since claims 4, 6, 13, and 17 are dependent claims, they share in the patentable distinctions of the claims 1 and 16 from which they depend.

The examiner has also rejected numerous claims as unpatentable over the above two references, further in view of Schaefer U.S. Patent 4,703,980.

The rejected claims here also are claims that are dependent upon claims 1 and 16, and the rejection also fails to provide a teaching of the patentable distinction of those parent claims.

In view of the above, allowance of the claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP



---

Garrettson Ellis  
Registration No. 22,792  
Attorney for Applicant

SEYFARTH SHAW LLP  
55 East Monroe Street, Suite 4200  
Chicago, Illinois 60603  
(312) 269-8567

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the U.S. Postal Service as First Class Mail in an envelope addressed to: Mail Stop: Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on Nov. 1, 2005.



---

Registered Attorney for Applicant  
Date: Nov. 1, 2005